United Nations S/PV.3954 (Resumption)

# Security Council

Fifty-third Year

*Provisional*

**3954**th Meeting

Wednesday, 23 December 1998, 3.30 p.m.

New York

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *President*: | Mr. Buallay | (Bahrain) |
| *Members*: | Brazil | Mr. Patriota |
| | China | Mr. Qin Huasun |
| | Costa Rica | Mr. Sáenz Biolley |
| | France | Mr. Dejammet |
| | Gabon | Mr. Moungara-Moussotsi |
| | Gambia | Mr. Touray |
| | Japan | Mr. Konishi |
| | Kenya | Mr. Kihwaga |
| | Portugal | Mr. Soares |
| | Russian Federation | Mr. Fedotov |
| | Slovenia | Mr. Türk |
| | Sweden | Mr. Dahlgren |
| | United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | Sir Jeremy Greenstock |
| | United States of America | Mr. Burleigh |

## Agenda

Maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building

98-86752 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

*The meeting was resumed on Wednesday, 23 December, at 4 p.m.*

**The President** (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Canada. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

**Mr. Duval** (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): We congratulate you, Sir, on convening this meeting on the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building. Too often, those two elements have been viewed as separate processes, while in fact they should be viewed as complementary parts of an integrated response to conflict. If we want to contribute to building lasting peace, the actions we take in this area will need to be better planned and coordinated.

In 1996 Canada launched a peace-building initiative in order to support local efforts to build lasting peace in areas of affected by conflicts. The objective is to support and supplement peacekeeping efforts through active diplomacy, by building coalitions with governmental and non-governmental partners, and by providing carefully targeted funding for innovative peace-building activities.

The implementation of this peace-building initiative has taught us that, to be truly effective, peace-building activities must address the security of individuals, including that of women and children. In the wake of conflicts, people need to be assured of their safety and well-being, particularly when civilians have been deliberately targeted. People need to be given a basis upon which to overcome apathy, to rebuild their lives and to regain hope for the future.

It goes without saying that not all the elements of post-conflict peace-building are the exclusive province of the Security Council. Nonetheless, the Security Council has a crucial role to play in ensuring that peacekeeping mandates anticipate, to the extent possible, the requirements of post-conflict peace-building and reconstruction. As appropriate, the Council mandates should incorporate provisions: to address the devastating impact of anti-personnel landmines on post-conflict reconstruction activities; for the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of combatants, including child soldiers; and to counteract the destabilizing effect of the proliferation of small arms.

The broader United Nations system must also be engaged in post-conflict peace-building activities if we hope to eliminate the deep-rooted — often historical and structural — causes of conflict. Without such an engagement, lasting peace will remain elusive. Further, other United Nations agencies and programmes, as well as the international financial institutions, the regional development organizations, bilateral aid programmes, international non-governmental organizations and the private sector have a role to play in rebuilding the economies and social structures of the affected countries and in supporting and nurturing a sustainable and lasting peace. Coordination is the crucial ingredient if we want all these efforts to be mutually reinforcing. And we also agree with the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, who said earlier in this debate that the Security Council must find ways to ensure that its political objectives and the financial recovery packages put in place by the international financial institutions complement one another. Otherwise we risk losing the gains that have been achieved, often at considerable human and financial cost, through what have come to be called classic peacekeeping operations.

Nonetheless, the countries emerging from conflicts retain the principal responsibility for providing for reconstruction and for reconciliation within their societies. If their citizens are not engaged in the effort, it is not a legitimate peace-building process.

The Special Representatives of the Secretary-General can play a pivotal role in building lasting peace by encouraging effective collaboration among the various stakeholders in a given country. We commend the practical and relevant recommendations developed by the forum on the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General, organized in July 1998 by the programme for international cooperation and conflict resolution of the Norwegian Institute for Applied Social Science. We draw particular attention to the recommendations that emphasize the importance of broad cooperation among institutions in order to enhance both the moral authority and the effectiveness of the Special Representatives. On questions involving a single country and on trans-border security questions, Special Representatives can encourage cooperation among the organizations and donors so as to better address the needs of countries emerging from conflicts. The United Nations Peace-Building Support Office in Liberia, headed by the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Mr. Felix Downes-Thomas, is a model to be emulated. We also fully support the Kenyan proposal, made earlier in this debate, that peace-building support structures should be established so as to provide effective coordination.

Lasting peace must also address the fundamental human rights of conflict victims. The United Nations needs to support local efforts to overcome the culture of impunity which all too often characterizes conflicts and which for too long has blocked the observance of the rights of individuals. For this reason Canada has steadfastly supported the establishment of a permanent International Criminal Court. Until the Court begins work, the Council must continue to give its full support to the ad hoc tribunals.

Peace and the maintenance of peace are the Security Council's fundamental responsibilities. We believe that the Council can, and must, serve as the catalyst for the international community's efforts to deal with post-conflict issues and to build genuine and lasting peace. Success requires the engagement of local actors together with international support that is carefully planned, coordinated, multidisciplinary and adapted to the needs of the countries emerging from conflicts. The Security Council cannot achieve this on its own. Just as surely, success in post-conflict peace-building cannot be achieved in the absence of the timely, full and active engagement of the Council.

**The President** (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Canada for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Norway. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

**Mr. Kolby** (Norway): The agenda item under consideration by the Security Council at today's meeting relates to the complex character of one of the most fundamental purposes of the United Nations: to maintain international peace and security. Conflict resolution and peace-building involve mediation, peacekeeping, humanitarian efforts, demobilization and disarmament efforts, reconstruction and reconciliation, enhancement of human rights and good governance, and long-term economic and social development.

We appreciate this opportunity to participate in a debate within the framework of the Security Council on the challenges of post-conflict follow-up and the consolidation of peace. Experience has taught us that a ceasefire and the establishment of a peacekeeping operation are not sufficient to ensure peaceful development in a war-torn society. Too often we have seen the hopes for a better future shattered. Too often the vicious cycle of violence has proved to be stronger than aspirations for peace. It is important to plan for post-conflict peace-building from the outset, when armed conflict is still ongoing.

Norway therefore supports the efforts by the Security Council over the past few years to develop and adopt more comprehensive mandates for United Nations peacekeeping operations. Recent mandates have encompassed aspects that are critical for long-term peace-building, including the facilitation of the reintegration of refugees, the demobilization of combatants, the collection of weapons, the reintegration into society of child soldiers and the reinstatement of legitimate Governments.

Successful implementation of post-conflict peace-building efforts requires a clear commitment by the parties involved. Measures must be identified and designed in close cooperation with those directly concerned, taking into account the specific conditions and needs in each particular situation. It is therefore of vital importance to address the need for post-conflict peace-building measures in the very early stages of conflict-resolution efforts, and to include such measures in the negotiations on peace accords.

The implementation of such comprehensive activities also necessitates close coordination among the various departments and agencies of the United Nations. We commend the initiatives taken in this respect by the Secretary-General, both at Headquarters level in the context of United Nations reform — most notably through the efforts by the Administrative Committee on Coordination — and in the field through the enhancement of the role of the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General. These efforts must be pursued and developed in the light of experience gained.

The large number of small arms available in conflict areas represents an important problem both during and after conflicts. There is a need to establish better control over transfers of small arms. There have been a number of encouraging regional initiatives in this regard, most notably the moratorium on the manufacture, export and import of light weapons declared by leaders of West African States on 30 October this year. Norway supports the call for a voluntary embargo on arms sales to conflict zones in Africa, as suggested by the United States. We welcome the proposal by the Secretary-General for increased transparency with regard to the supply of weapons to areas of actual or potential conflict, including measures to monitor and regulate the role of arms brokers.

The international community should support the implementation of such initiatives. In order to help the United Nations assist in national and regional initiatives effectively and without delay, Norway recently launched a trust fund for support to prevention and reduction of the proliferation of small arms. We encourage other countries to contribute to the fund.

Anti-personnel landmines also constitute a formidable obstacle to post-conflict reconstruction and the consolidation of peace. Norway is strongly committed to the follow-up to the Ottawa Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, including demining and rehabilitation activities, to which we have allocated $120 million over the period 1998-2002.

The report of the Secretary-General on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa (S/1998/318) clearly underlines the need for a holistic approach, where economic and social issues must be an integral part of international endeavours to secure and strengthen peace. This is true for Africa, but it is also true for other regions. Coherence must be ensured between the work of the Security Council and that of other bodies of the United Nations, in particular the General Assembly.

In many instances, it will also be important to improve coordination and information-sharing between the United Nations and regional organizations such as the Organization of African Unity and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). The United Nations should play a leading role to ensure that all international efforts are carried out in a coordinated and efficient way. We must secure a better unity of purpose and integrate United Nations peace-building efforts with those of other stakeholders. Norway will assume the chairmanship of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe in 1999, and we are determined to further refine the already well established working relationship between the United Nations and the OSCE.

Although each country has the main responsibility for ensuring a political climate that is conducive to stability and economic growth, the international community must provide broad support. Norway is strongly committed to doing its part. An important target of Norwegian development cooperation is to provide adequate funds and human resources to ensure that the critical post-conflict phase represents a bridge from despair to sustained peace and long-term development.

**The President** (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

**Mr. Elaraby** (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Allow me at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month and to convey to you our confidence that your rich diplomatic experience and wisdom will enable the Council to shoulder its responsibilities in the best possible way.

Under Article I of the Charter, the maintenance of international peace and security is one of the purposes of the United Nations, but it is also the essence of the role of the Organization and its main *raison d'être*.

The Charter contains well-defined measures to deter the aggressor in cases of aggression or the threat of aggression. But the course of events since the Charter was drafted, including differences in the nature of conflicts and the surrounding circumstances, has proved that it is almost impossible to implement the model designed by the Charter. Clear-cut cases where the Council easily identified the aggressor and the aggression and where it took the decision to use military force have been very few. It is in this context that peacekeeping operations were established, but experience has proved that peacekeeping operations do not completely satisfy the requirements of peace-building. The process of peace-building requires that the United Nations play an integrated, multi-faceted and more action-oriented role in order to create a climate conducive to political and economic stability in the State concerned.

While peacekeeping operations are aimed at creating an atmosphere of stability in the short term, it is imperative to conceive a series of long-term measures that would put an end to the chaos caused by a conflict, the continuance of which could generate new conflicts.

The importance of the concept of post-conflict peace-building to the work of the United Nations was underlined by the former Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, when he submitted to the General Assembly and to the Security Council the reports entitled "An Agenda for Peace" and subsequently "Supplement to An Agenda for Peace". That initiative which was meant to explain how to apply this concept with full respect for the existing balance between the principal organs of the United Nations. The ideas presented in "An

Agenda for Peace" were well received, and the General Assembly adopted its resolution 47/120 acknowledging the importance of the proposals on this concept and deciding to continue their substantive consideration.

The Assembly's thorough consideration of this important issue revealed that the concept needed further elucidation through the drafting of a working paper to reflect agreed details on the definition, principles, framework and scope of post-conflict peace-building activities as well as the role of the United Nations system in undertaking these activities. After lengthy discussion, agreement was reached on all aspects of a working paper, dated 17 January 1997. Regrettably, the opposition of one delegation prevented the adoption of the paper by the General Assembly. The opposition focused only on a paragraph stating that the General Assembly had the key role in post-conflict peace-building activities. All other delegations were then of the view that decisions on such activities must be entrusted primarily to the General Assembly, which could receive support from other principal organs of the United Nations, and from the specialized agencies.

Egypt believes that there is an integral relationship between the maintenance of international peace and security on the one hand, and post-conflict peace-building on the other. We also consider that post-conflict peace-building is one of the main responsibilities of the General Assembly. The Security Council or any other major organ of the United Nations system could play a supportive role to the primary role of the General Assembly in this field. The relationship that we see between the maintenance of international peace and security on the one hand, and post-conflict peace-building on the other, stems from the fact that measures for post-conflict peace-building can follow the successful end of a peacekeeping mission.

Therefore, it is beneficial to ensure smooth transition from peacekeeping operations, which are usually established by the Security Council — although the General Assembly also has that competence — to post-conflict peace-building activities under the supervision of the General Assembly.

I find it important at this juncture to refer to some of the imperatives for the success of any post-conflict peace-building activities. Post-conflict peace-building should be carried out in full respect for the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, in particular the principles of sovereign equality, political independence, and non-intervention in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. As a rule, it should be undertaken only at the request of and with the consent of the State concerned. It should be based upon the genuine will of the conflicting parties to cease and not to resume hostilities, and to commit themselves to national reconciliation, development and durable peace. It should be resorted to on a case by case basis, bearing in mind the requirements and needs of each State together with its cultural characteristics, as well as the right of each State freely to choose and develop its economic, political and cultural systems in full freedom. Post-conflict peace-building activities should have the support of the United Nations system as a whole in the context of defining these activities and of their implementation.

In this connection, we consider that the types of activities to be used after a conflict should be selected on a case by case basis, as I stated earlier. Meanwhile, I would like to highlight the importance of some activities which we find essential for the success of post-conflict peace-building, particularly in Africa — namely, the return of refugees, the resettling of internally displaced persons, reorientation and reintegration of former combatants into the ranks of productive civil society and, of course, demining. These are in addition to the activities that were highlighted by the Secretary-General in his report to the General Assembly and the Security Council entitled "The causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa" (S/1998/318). These activities include assistance in rebuilding the economic and social infrastructure, assistance in reintegration into the world economy, direct economic and financial assistance and provision of humanitarian relief assistance.

In conclusion, I must emphasize the importance of the United Nations remaining the focal point for both facilitating and coordinating post-conflict peace-building activities, with the help and support of outside actors such as the World Bank and other financial institutions that could contribute to such activities. This will necessitate agreement among us, as Member States of the United Nations, on the basic rules of post-conflict peace-building operations. My delegation feels that the working paper of 17 January 1997, to which I referred a few moments ago, still provides a solid basis for this agreement, and we hope that it will be adopted by the General Assembly by consensus.

**The President** (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Egypt for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Austria. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

**Mr. Sucharipa** (Austria): It is a special pleasure for me today to address the high representatives of this Council under your most able leadership, Mr. President, which we are confident will ensure a successful conclusion of the deliberations of the Council this month.

I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. In addition, the Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia — and the associated country Cyprus, as well as the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area, Iceland and Liechtenstein, align themselves with this statement.

In the past few years, peacekeeping operations have become increasingly multidimensional. United Nations peacekeeping today encompasses not only demanding military tasks, but also a variety of other functions which expand into the area of peace-building, such as civilian police activities, humanitarian assistance, demining, practical disarmament measures, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants, enhancing and monitoring respect for human rights, support for democratic development, including election monitoring, and last but not least, public information. The European Union considers this a positive development which also proves the United Nations potential to meet new demands.

The multidimensional quality of today's peacekeeping operations poses new challenges to the United Nations, both at headquarters and in the field. Military and civilian personnel have to be specially trained, prepared and equipped for their ever more complex missions. Their tasks have to be coordinated with the respective activities of United Nations bodies and programmes.

At headquarters, this requires an integrated, coordinated approach with regard to actions which most often address combinations of political, legal, institutional, military, humanitarian, human rights-related, environmental, economic, social, cultural, and demographic factors of conflicts. In the field, this is greatly facilitated by special representatives and United Nations coordinators, who are given overall responsibility and authority with regard to the coordination of United Nations efforts and cooperation with national and international partners, as well as non-governmental organizations.

The European Union expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his valuable efforts in this respect, and in particular for the relevant proposals made and measures implemented in the context of United Nations reform. They have significantly enhanced the ability of the United Nations to respond to the complexities of post-cold-war conflict situations. With respect to peace-building in particular, we commend the Administrative Committee on Coordination for developing the new strategic framework concept, which provides a basis for more coherent strategies to link all aspects of external support for countries afflicted by conflict.

Furthermore, we would like to sincerely commend the Secretary-General for his valuable analysis pertaining to related matters, as contained in his landmark report, "The causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa" (S/1998/318).

The European Union welcomes the Security Council's continued efforts in responding to the challenges of combining peacekeeping and peace-building, in particular with regard to the new peacekeeping operations established this year in Africa, in the Central African Republic and in Sierra Leone.

In this connection, we would also like to welcome the Council's resolutions and presidential statements issued since the ministerial meeting in September 1997 on the situation in Africa, and in particular those documents which were adopted upon consideration of the assessments made by the Secretary-General in his report.

With regard to the recent General Assembly resolutions, let me recall the initiative "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures" by one of the European Union's Member States, which was co-sponsored by all 15 European Union countries. Integrating a wide variety of aspects from disarmament to peacekeeping matters, it is aimed at helping affected countries and regions that need assistance with regard to conflict resolution and post-conflict rehabilitation.

International peace and security today must, obviously, signify much more than the absence of war between States. Peace, security, sustainable development, human rights and good governance are interdependent.

Modern day crises are, more often than not, intra-State rather than international conflicts, triggered by a range of factors, including social, ethnic or religious strife, the violation of human rights, poverty, inequitable distribution of resources, environmental degradation, large-scale migration, organized crime and terrorism.

To address and prevent violent conflicts caused by such crises, the United Nations has developed a comprehensive set of policy measures aimed at conflict prevention, management and resolution, including through peacekeeping and peace-building. With regard to the latter, the European Union recognizes that peace-building measures could apply in all phases of conflict and peace. However, as peace-building activities will generally embrace projects and programmes with the longer aim of the stabilization of societies, their impact will be greatest in non-violent situations, including post-conflict situations.

Since 1995, the European Union has adopted a number of important documents concerning peace-building, conflict prevention and resolution. Key amongst these are the June 1997 Common Position and Council conclusions on conflict prevention and resolution in Africa.

On 30 November this year, the Council of the European Union adopted conclusions, restating, *inter alia*, that the approach to peace-building, conflict prevention and resolution that has been developed within the Union, mainly in view of the African continent, should be extended to all developing regions. The Council of the European Union emphasized that full use should be made of the potential of development cooperation to contribute to peace, democracy and stability. It further welcomed, in particular, the respective assessments given by the United Nations Secretary-General in his report on Africa.

All this reflects the European Union's commitment to a proactive policy on conflict prevention and resolution, focusing on preventing the outbreak of violence at an early stage, as well as on peace-building, while using the full range of policy instruments available, including development assistance.

The Union underlines that the peoples concerned must take a lead role in peace-building, conflict prevention and resolution. We also stress that viable solutions can be achieved only through enhanced local ownership. Activities must, to the largest extent possible, build on local capacities and institutions.

Post-conflict reconstruction and peace-building aimed at the prevention of future conflicts are much more than repairing physical infrastructure. To address the root causes of violent conflicts in a targeted manner, it is imperative to consider the socio-political impact of assistance programmes and measures. For the European Union, support for democratization, the strengthening of legitimacy and of the effectiveness of government, respect for human rights, the rule of law and good governance play crucial roles in this regard.

We also strongly underline that external assistance, including peace-building measures, to societies in crisis or conflict should aim at promoting a fair balance of political, social, economic and cultural opportunity among different groups and at strengthening mechanisms for peaceful conciliation and the bridging of dividing lines. Furthermore, we should like to stress the importance, in this connection, of a vibrant civil society.

The Union fully shares the view of the Secretary-General, expressed in his report on Africa, that protecting human rights, and in particular political rights and economic freedoms; promoting transparency and accountability in public administration; and fighting corruption are not merely crucial, but prerequisites for building peace and promoting development.

Guided by the principles which I have just mentioned, the European Union has made considerable and continuous contributions to peace-building efforts through various programmes in our own continent, in particular with respect to the conflict in the former Yugoslavia, in the Middle East, in Africa, in Latin America and elsewhere. For its effectiveness, action by the Union also relies on active cooperation with the United Nations; other international organizations; regional organizations, such as the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE); and subregional organizations. In this connection, we would also like to draw the Council's attention to the concept of mutually reinforcing institutions, contained in a document recently adopted by the Council of the European Union, which emphasizes the necessity of ensuring that the involvement of more than one organization and its member States results in complementary and mutually supportive contributions.

Let me conclude with a few practical thoughts on peacekeeping and peace-building and their possible interdependence. Many of today's peacekeeping operations provide an indispensable basis for wider

peace-building efforts. Their presence is in fact a precondition for the successful start or continuation of peace-building programmes, which usually makes it logical and necessary to integrate strong peace-building elements into peacekeeping operations. On the other hand, effective peace-building efforts can provide the conditions for peacekeeping missions to wind down or be completed once peace has become sustainable. Ideally, they would help to limit the duration and size of peacekeeping operations and other external interventions. For all these reasons, the European Union strongly supports United Nations endeavours to combine peacekeeping and peace-building measures in a balanced and complementary manner.

We would like to stress in this regard that there is no comprehensive peace-building design and that it might not even be useful trying to define it. Peace-building measures have to be chosen and tailored according to the specific situations and different causes of conflict. This holds particularly true when they are part of or interlinked with peacekeeping operations. Identifying them will best be done in the peace accords between the parties to conflicts.

We fully subscribe to the Secretary-General's view, again expressed in his report on Africa, that peace-building does not replace ongoing humanitarian and development activities in countries emerging from crisis, but rather aims at building on, adding to or reorienting such activities in ways designed to reduce the risk of a resumption of conflict and contribute to creating conditions conducive to reconciliation, reconstruction and recovery.

Peace-building measures have to be designed and implemented accordingly. They will also require long-term commitments, pragmatism, flexibility, creativity and the will to provide all necessary resources. But the efforts to make and the price to pay for peace will always seem small when compared to the human, social and economic losses incurred in protracted or resumed violent conflicts.

**The President** (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Austria for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Pakistan. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

**Mr. Kamal** (Pakistan): It is ironic for us to be addressing the role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security at a time when the ability of this Council to play it has been dealt a devastating blow as a result of a unilateral action undertaken without due debate and authorization from the Council. Perhaps this underlines how deep is the need for the reform of the working methods of the Security Council and of its members in order to bring them into line with the aspirations and expectations of the general membership of the United Nations, as incarnated in the General Assembly.

The very first Article of the Charter outlines one of the purposes of the establishment of the United Nations as the maintenance of international peace and security. While the General Assembly was empowered to consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security and to discuss any questions brought before it by any Member State or by the Security Council, the primary responsibility in this regard was conferred on the Security Council itself. This arrangement was devised with a view to ensuring prompt and effective action by the United Nations.

Since the establishment of the United Nations, the General Assembly and the Security Council have attempted to work more or less in tandem in addressing this subject. Meanwhile, the broader parameters of peace and security have expanded in recent years. As the Secretary-General has mentioned in his annual report to the General Assembly, there exist

> "many other threats to human security, such as natural disasters, ethnic tension and human rights violations" (*A/53/1, para. 27*)

which may also be sources of conflict. The United Nations therefore needs to adopt an integrated approach in addressing the issues concerning the maintenance of international peace and security.

In the post-cold-war period, the dimensions of United Nations activities have changed significantly. A range of new concepts has emerged in the process of dealing with the new challenges, including preventive diplomacy, peace-building and peace enforcement. Some of these concepts were thoroughly discussed by the Member States in the Working Group on an Agenda for Peace and its four sub-groups with a view to reaching common understandings. While the two sub-groups on coordination and on United Nations sanctions have concluded their work, the sub-groups on preventive diplomacy and peacekeeping and on post-conflict peace-building could not conclude their deliberations for lack of consensus. In the case of post-conflict peace-building,

only one country opposed the adoption of the recommendations of the sub-group, and this led to a deadlock. Hopefully, the recommendations of that sub-group can move forward now.

In the immediate post-cold war period, there was a surge in the peacekeeping activities of the United Nations. In 1994, the total number of United Nations troops and observers deployed went up to about 73,000 in 17 peacekeeping missions, but this was followed by a period of relative decline. At present, there are only about 14,000 troops and observers deployed in 17 peacekeeping missions, including the two new missions set up over the past year in the Central African Republic and in Sierra Leone. The decline in United Nations involvement cannot be taken to indicate that the number of conflicts or disputes has decreased. In fact, the decline is to be attributed only to the reluctance to engage in new operations for various reasons, including financial constraints. In some cases, this responsibility has been conveniently shifted or sub-contracted to regional organizations. We agree with the Secretary-General that United Nations peacekeeping offers unique advantages not to be found elsewhere, including the universality of its mandate and the breadth of its experience. The United Nations must therefore continue to play its primary role in maintaining international peace and security. The role of the regional organizations must be strictly governed by Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter.

The pitfalls of the United Nations undertaking half-hearted peacekeeping operations are enormous, and stand as a sad commentary on the actual capacity of the United Nations to deliver. The Jammu and Kashmir dispute, one of the very oldest on the agenda of the Security Council, is a case in point. The failure of the international community to fulfil its commitment to the people of Jammu and Kashmir has brought India and Pakistan to conflict several times in recent decades. Unfortunately, no determined and sustained efforts have been made by the United Nations to resolve the root causes of the conflict.

In view of the heightening tensions in the region in recent months, we have requested the Secretary-General to further strengthen the United Nations presence along the line of control for effectively monitoring cross-border violations along the disputed territory of Kashmir. A request has also been made to the Secretary-General to appoint a special representative to coordinate the efforts of the United Nations in this volatile region. No follow-up has been recorded so far.

This is particularly important because of the need to defuse the new and heightened tensions that arose in South Asia after the nuclear tests conducted by India, and then by Pakistan, early this year. The Security Council, in its wisdom, adopted resolution 1172 (1998) on 6 June 1998 in an attempt to enforce non-proliferation, contrary to the letter and the spirit of various international instruments and treaties, rather than ensuring the implementation of its own resolutions on Jammu and Kashmir, a dispute of which the Security Council remains seized, and which is the root cause of the tension between India and Pakistan. We believe that the prime responsibility of the Security Council should continue to be peace and security and ensuring respect for its own resolutions.

The conflict in Afghanistan is another example of the failure of the United Nations to fulfil its responsibilities under the Charter. The international community lost all interest in Afghanistan soon after the withdrawal of the occupying Soviet forces from that country. Afghanistan was allowed to be plunged into civil strife, resulting in the further destruction of the war-stricken country. Consequently, over 1.5 million Afghan refugees still reside in Pakistan. Because of donor fatigue, we are providing succour to them almost single-handedly. The international community must accept the blame for its inaction and should remedy the situation by playing its due role in bringing peace to the Afghan people and by contributing towards the reconstruction of that devastated country.

The conflicts in Africa constitute almost 60 per cent of the issues currently under consideration by the Security Council. The best way to prepare for the emergencies in that continent would be to develop an efficient early warning system and to build appropriate capabilities to effectively respond to simmering crises in Africa, as in other parts of the world.

The key to a better management of peace and security lies in a shared responsibility between the General Assembly and the Security Council, balancing what we expect of the latter, with its smaller membership, with what we expect of the former, with its undoubted democratic weight. On too many occasions the Security Council has been unwilling or unable to fulfil its responsibilities, either because of blockages created by the veto or the unilateral actions of one or another of its permanent members, or because it has lacked the collective courage and verve to implement its own resolutions.

For its part, Pakistan remains committed to the purposes and principles of the Charter and will continue to contribute in every possible way to achieving our goals of collective security and peace and prosperity.

**The President** (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Tunisia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

**Mr. Hachani** (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, my delegation would like to congratulate you, Sir, on the way in which you have been carrying out your work as President of the Security Council, and we wish you complete success in the discharge of your important functions.

We congratulate the Security Council on its decision to hold this important formal meeting, with a debate open to all Members of the Organization on the subject of "Maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building".

The wording of the agenda item makes clear one fundamental fact that is becoming increasingly evident: the close link between peacekeeping and post-conflict peace-building through various actions aimed at making peace sustainable.

Throughout its existence, the United Nations has built up valuable experience in peacekeeping, having managed to prevent numerous conflicts and restore and maintain peace in various places throughout the world, in particular by coming between belligerents so as to facilitate the conclusion and implementation of peace agreements. The Organization certainly has to its credit numerous successes of which it can be proud today. That extensive United Nations experience in peacekeeping, especially during the past decade, nonetheless teaches us, among other things, how vital it is after conflicts to ensure that all the conditions are met so that peace can continue.

Hence the need to do everything possible to strengthen confidence among the former parties to a conflict, to create a new climate favourable to national reconciliation and to encourage the resumption of economic and social activities that improve the daily lives of the population by addressing the underlying causes of conflict. Therein lies the importance of post-conflict peace-building.

On the new international post-cold-war chessboard, post-conflict peace-building is so important to the maintenance of peace that it is an essential counterpart and even a corollary to it. Peace-building has many facets. These include crucial and complementary measures which together contribute to the restoration of confidence, to the re-establishment of normal life and to the rebirth of hope among people; in a word, they contribute to a return to normalcy in the country or countries ravaged by war, depending on whether the conflict was internal or between two State entities. Among these facets, it is important to mention disarmament, demining, electoral assistance, the repatriation and resettlement of refugees and displaced persons and economic reconstruction.

These are the most important peace-building measures, to whose implementation the international community must actively and substantively contribute, in particular through the Security Council, the General Assembly and other bodies and agencies of the United Nations, each in its own area of competence.

My delegation emphasizes the need to give post-conflict peace-building programmes and their implementation the greatest chance for success for the benefit of peace. For that, we believe that certain parameters should guide the international community's action in this area.

We are thinking first of the urgency of the effective implementation of peace-building programmes. For even if in principle the concept of peace-building implies that it will take place following the end of hostilities and upon the achievement of a political settlement, the boundary is not so clear-cut between a given United Nations peacekeeping operation and post-conflict peace-building activities. Thus, even before the end of a conflict, the needs of the countries concerned should be identified and the means for meeting them should be known. Some peace-building activities, such as demining or disarmament and electoral assistance, benefit from being carried out before the end of the actual United Nations peacekeeping operation, if there is one. It is also preferable to begin operations to repatriate refugees and displaced persons as soon as possible, as humanitarian problems have a direct impact on all national reconciliation efforts. Economic recovery activities should also be undertaken without delay.

Secondly, my delegation considers that it is necessary for all post-conflict peace-building efforts to be coordinated with the various actors involved. All peace-building programmes must reflect an overall integrated

and coherent strategy which takes into account the needs and specific characteristics of the countries in question. In addition to humanitarian programmes, we are thinking here of activities such as those related to economic and social reconstruction which require a contribution by donor countries and by the United Nations and its various organs and specialized agencies.

Thirdly, the international community should give particular attention to the financing of economic recovery as part of post-conflict peace-building. Two remarks are appropriate here relating on the one hand, to the need for rapid availability of these resources, and on the other hand, to the necessary consideration of the degree of fragility of peace in the country or countries concerned. This requires flexible financial conditions which are as concessional as possible, as suggested by the Secretary-General in his report on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa.

Finally, we would like to repeat the importance to all peace-building activity of the principles of the consent of the parties involved to receiving assistance from the international community, of respect for national sovereignty of the countries concerned, and of non-interference in their internal affairs.

Tunisia has participated in United Nations peacekeeping activities since the beginning of the 1960s through its contributions to various United Nations peacekeeping operations. Today, my country is participating in three of these operations by providing civilian police contingents. This civilian police sector is a new post-conflict peace-building activity which is being used increasingly by the United Nations.

Tunisia is determined to continue to support this United Nations work and is following with interest the Security Council's deliberations on this matter, deliberations which, in our view, should lead to a clearer concept of post-conflict peace-building, to improvement in its practice and to greater clarification of its link to peacekeeping.

**The President** (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Tunisia for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Argentina. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

**Mr. Petrella** (Argentina)(*interpretation from Spanish*): Allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on the effective manner in which you have been presiding over the work of the Security Council during the month of December. I also wish to congratulate you on the initiative to convene an open debate on this important issue. In view of your experience and cool-headedness, we are convinced that these complex issues will be dealt with in an appropriate manner. Allow me to extend my congratulations also to your predecessor, Ambassador A. Peter Burleigh of the United States. His keen professionalism and positive attitude towards all members and non-members of the Council are truly appreciated.

The matter before the Council is particularly relevant to Argentina, given its interest in peacekeeping and post-conflict peace-building matters. In this connection, experience appears to indicate that peace-building activities raise at least two questions. The first is whether peace-building activities have a basis in the Charter, and the second is when is the best time to begin them?

With regard to the very concept of peace-building activities, it is clear to us today that the concept of international peace and security rests on more qualitative and complex aspects than those which emerge from the traditional interpretation of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter. This is logical because since the end of the cold war, a strict interpretation of concepts established in 1945 no longer meets today's needs.

With regard to the second question — when is the best time to begin peace-building activities — it seems to us a formalist view which favours the legal end of the conflict can actually undermine the inherent objective of these peace-building activities. In fact, experience also suggests, depending on the characteristics of each conflict, the usefulness of anticipating peace-building activities even before the conflict is formally ended. Obviously, this assumes the minimal conditions for multidimensional action.

Argentina has traditionally maintained that the humanitarian, institutional, economic and ethnic consequences of conflicts show that much more than a ceasefire is needed to initiate a lasting peace. At this moment in history, when problems are essentially problems within States, this is even more apparent.

The issues involved in Central America's reconstruction demonstrated the far-reaching importance

of peace-building activities when such activities are taken on, in a show of considerable maturity by the protagonists of the conflict as their own objectives.

In the case of the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador (ONUSAL), the United Nations Secretariat played an innovative and central role in the negotiation of agreements and the monitoring of peace-building. The experience of the Representative of the Secretary-General in this operation recalls the importance of cooperation between the Security Council and financial institutions in order to promote development.

In the case of Haiti, which is currently on the Council's agenda, it seems clearly advisable at this time to explore mechanisms for reconstruction, particularly in view of the fact that the political situation in that country is becoming increasingly stable. Just as in the case of ONUSAL, reconciliation, democracy, good governance and development represent the road to success. Also as in the case of ONUSAL, in Haiti the work of the representatives of the Secretary-General has been, and continues to be, extremely useful.

We have mentioned these two cases because, in our view, they represent positive experiences for other undertakings. Moreover, these situations serve as examples of the fact that in some regions, such as the Americas, the concept of peace and security draws inspiration from the qualitative elements we mentioned at the beginning of our statement.

In conclusion, allow me to stress some ideas that we believe might be useful in this respect.

First, as we said at the outset, we find ourselves at a time when the concept of peace and security is based on broader criteria than in 1945. This important characteristic can be seen clearly in the examples of Latin America and the Caribbean, to which I have referred briefly.

Secondly, peace-building activities do not necessarily start with the signing of a peace agreement; they may begin at a later stage of a multidimensional operation once the minimum conditions for action have been met.

Thirdly, we should avoid any approach that tends to involve exclusionary criteria. Coordinated efforts on the part of the international community and of the various agencies of the United Nations system are needed. Likewise, in order for peace-building activities to lead to durable peace and reconciliation, we must also create the necessary conditions for sustainable development in the context of democracy.

Finally, no operation of this kind can be successful if it lacks the necessary funds or personnel. When donor fatigue prevails, such issues require special attention. How and from where should resources be obtained? That question will have to be answered in future if we want to keep in check problems that could ultimately also result in considerable costs.

**The President** (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Argentina for the kind words he addressed to me and to my predecessor.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of the Republic of Korea. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

**Mr. Lee See-Young** (Republic of Korea): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to express my delegation's appreciation to you for your initiative to organize the Security Council's open meeting today on the important issue before us. We also welcome today's meeting as yet another meaningful step forward in restoring the transparency of the work of the Security Council.

In many conflict situations these days, it has become increasingly hard to define a clear boundary between peacekeeping and post-conflict peace-building operations. More often than not, maintaining peace is as difficult as restoring peace. It is therefore imperative for the international community to take a holistic approach to ensure not only the restoration of peace but also its consolidation in conflict areas.

When the Security Council considers authorizing peacekeeping operations which would involve post-conflict peace-building activities, the Council, in our view, should provide clear, realistic and appropriate mandates for such activities, backed by sufficient resources. It is equally important to respect the distinct mandates of other United Nations organs, bodies or agencies which cover post-conflict peace-building measures.

Having said that, I would like to comment on the following four points to which my Government attaches particular importance.

My first point concerns the need for more effective coordination among all actors as well as local capacity-building. The multifaceted nature of post-conflict peace-building inevitably brings together a number of different bodies and actors. First and foremost, it is important to maintain close coordination between the two major organs of the United Nations, namely the General Assembly and the Security Council, which have the main political responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security under the Charter.

My delegation supports the coordinating role of the Department of Political Affairs as the focal point at Headquarters and that of special or other representatives of Secretary-General in the field, as set out in the Secretary-General's report of 18 November 1998.

In this connection, we look forward to further elaboration of the Secretary-General's suggestion in favour of the strategic framework approach for response to and recovery from crisis. My delegation hopes that such a strategic framework would be formulated as soon as possible, drawing on the various lessons learned from past experiences. In this process, special attention should be paid to the need to ensure the smooth transition from the peacekeeping phase to peace-building activities.

We are of the view that one of the main focuses should be on exploring the practical ways and means to cultivate the local capacity to sustain peace in the fragile conditions of the post-conflict period. It is not only more effective but also more economical to help local communities to build their own capacities to sustain peace in the long run. In this connection, the involvement of regional or subregional organizations in the process would be very useful, given their geographical proximity and comparative advantage in terms of local information. Moreover, in view of the financial burdens of various peace-building activities, it is also necessary to explore the possibility of engaging international financial institutions in this process at an early date.

Secondly, we believe that measures towards disarmament and demobilization, including the collection and dismantling of small arms and the rehabilitation of militias, are keys to avoiding the recurrence of violence and to building peace in post-conflict situations. With this in mind, my Government contributed $250,000 last year, when we served on the Council, to the programmes for the demobilization and reintegration of former combatants in Angola.

We welcome the ongoing efforts of the Council to enhance the effective implementation of the arms embargoes already imposed by the Council. With cross-border arms flows well in place, however, country-specific arms embargoes do not suffice to stem the illicit trafficking of arms. In this regard, we look forward to the Secretary-General's playing a positive role in implementing the Security Council recommendations on the regional approach to the illicit flow of arms to and in Africa, as contained in Council resolution 1209 (1998) of 19 November this year. We believe that the establishment of appropriate regional and subregional registers of conventional arms should not be limited to Africa but should be expanded to other continents as well. More efforts should also be made to deal with the supply side of the arms flow.

Thirdly, I wish to stress the importance of demining as one of the essential components of post-conflict peace-building. Given the sheer number of landmines strewn over the globe and the formidable costs of their clearance, the impact of anti-personnel landmines extends beyond the immediate danger to lives and property to a wide array of socio-economic and developmental aspects in the mine-affected countries.

Mine clearance is now a global agenda requiring global action. We therefore welcome the establishment of the United Nations Mine Action Service as the focal point for mine action within the United Nations system. We hope that the Service will strengthen its cooperation with various regional and subregional organizations.

Since 1996, my country has actively participated in the Mine Action Support Group as a donor and made contributions to the United Nations Trust Fund to help with mine clearance in Cambodia, Tajikistan and Ethiopia.

Last but not least, we would like to invite the Council, once again, to give special attention to the need for ensuring the security and safety of United Nations and other personnel, as well as the security and safety of all innocent civilians in conflict situations. We believe that the Council should continue to give high priority to this issue.

In this connection, my delegation welcomes the specific recommendation contained in Council resolution 1208 (1998) to include, in the United Nations Stand-by Arrangements, military and police units and personnel trained for humanitarian operations, together with related

equipment. We support this recommendation's early translation into action. We wish to request Council members to continue to look at other options to enhance the security and safety of all those in need of protection as well as of their protectors.

Post-conflict peace-building is indeed a very challenging task for the international community today, as the number of conflict situations grows in the post-cold-war era. In particular, it takes even greater time and energy to build peace and socio-economic infrastructure in cases where States fail or societies collapse. The international community should avoid wasting the valuable resources it has spent to restore peace by leaving that peace vulnerable to renewed conflicts.

We welcome today's open meeting as an opportunity to increase international awareness of this important issue. We sincerely hope that the views and suggestions presented here today will help Council members and the United Nations system as a whole to better address this important and urgent issue and to take relevant actions as necessary sooner rather than later.

**The President** (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of the Republic of Korea for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Mongolia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

**Mr. Enkhsaikhan** (Mongolia): I am honoured to have the opportunity to address the Council on this agenda item. At the outset, I would like to express our gratitude to you, Mr. President, for initiating and organizing the consideration of this important issue.

We believe that thematic consideration of wider issues pertaining to strengthening international peace and security is quite useful, especially when there is wider participation and input, as at this meeting. In this regard, we believe that the several meetings devoted to Africa and its problems — including the meetings on the causes of conflict in Africa, on the question of children and armed conflict, and others — have proved to be useful, not only in drawing the attention of the international community to these pressing issues, but also in determining adequate responses to them. Therefore, we believe that today's consideration will prove useful as well.

Taking a broader approach to security implies addressing wider dimensions of international security. Being the organ of the United Nations with the principal responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security, the Security Council is expected to address these questions. Post-cold-war practice has vividly demonstrated that there is a direct link between the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building. As far back as 1992 this link was underlined in the Secretary-General's report "An Agenda for Peace" and its supplement. Since then life has shown that peace-building, peacemaking and peacekeeping operations can be truly lasting if and when the question of post-conflict peace-building is correctly and successfully tackled. We fully agree that, though post-conflict peace-building may not be considered part of peacekeeping and peacemaking, the essential elements of post-conflict peace-building should be borne in mind and, to the extent possible, reflected in peace agreements and settlements. On the other hand, when post-conflict peace-building is successful, it, in its own turn, broadens and strengthens the foundations of peace and security.

Almost seven years have passed since the summit meeting of the Security Council addressed broader issues of international peace and security. The post-cold-war experience — be it in many countries of the Africa continent, in Cambodia or in Central America — demonstrates that disarming the previously warring parties, the destruction of weapons, demining, restoration of order, repatriation of refugees, organizing and monitoring elections, strengthening governmental institutions and, in many cases, promoting the fuller political participation of former adversaries are all important factors in post-conflict peace-building. The example of Mozambique and some other positive examples have been cited here. Other examples — or should I say, lessons — caution that ignoring post-conflict peace-building makes peace very fragile.

With the increasing interdependence of States and increasing globalization, non-traditional — or should I say, non-military — sources of threats to peace and security are also increasing. This demands that the socio-economic root causes of many conflicts also be properly addressed. Otherwise, no peace can be stable or durable. Today's consideration of this item bears testimony to the realization and acceptance of this reality.

It is also of great importance to address properly the question of national reconciliation and the psychological and political factors that define the attitudes of States in

conflict towards each other, or of parties in case of internal conflicts. In our view, mutual suspicion needs to be overcome and social peace allowed to take root and develop if the recurrence of conflict is to be avoided.

Furthermore, the root causes — that is, the underlying political, economic, social and ethnic problems that have led to the conflict in the first place — ought to be seriously addressed and dealt with.

Otherwise, previously taken measures, however important and successful they might have been, would only be half measures. In this, we believe, the role not only of the Security Council, but of all the relevant United Nations bodies, especially the General Assembly, as well as the Economic and Social Council, development agencies, financial institutions, regional organizations and the donor community is essential.

In that regard, the reform of the United Nations system should also address the questions of the roles of the appropriate United Nations bodies in more effectively addressing the questions of development. We believe that the emerging new concept of human security provides the opportunity to address this question in a more comprehensive manner. As today's debate underlines, the questions of proper coordination of the post-conflict peace-building efforts of the international community, of avoiding duplication and of financing these actions need to be addressed. With respect to the latter, effective mobilization of internal and international resources is of crucial importance. Equally, short-term peace-building measures need to be followed up by long-term programmes and strategies aimed at strengthening national institutions, promoting good governance, eradicating poverty and ensuring sustainable development.

In conclusion, it would not be an exaggeration to say that the Security Council has been dealing mostly with immediate problems and has not so often considered questions of ensuring peace and security in the broader context. We believe that addressing other, broader issues of the maintenance of international peace and security, such as the one that is being considered today, would not only promote further transparency and wider participation by States that are not members of the Council, but would also prove quite useful.

**The President** *(interpretation from Arabic):* I thank the representative of Mongolia for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Croatia. I invite her to take a seat at the Council table and to make her statement.

**Ms. Grčić Polić** (Croatia): I thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this exchange of views. We sincerely hope that today's deliberations will help us better understand, and therefore refine, the existing methods or conceptualize new methods of maintaining or restoring international peace and security. The current situation in Iraq represents another poignant reminder that thorough discussions on how to maintain peace and security are needed. There are just too many open, even controversial, questions concerning the role of the United Nations and the Security Council in relation to the role of regional organizations, which have to be resolved.

It is a well-known fact that the world is becoming ever more interdependent. A crisis in today's day and age — be it financial, humanitarian or other — embodies a potential to affect entire regions, and beyond. The most recent examples include the Asian financial crisis, where the collapse of markets in Indonesia and Korea was felt from Japan and Australia to Europe and the United States, and the Rwandan conflict, which, though its intensity waned many years ago, has now affected much of Central Africa.

Experience teaches us that any crisis can be better handled in its early stages. In this regard, one might ask whether optimal use of potentials following the fall of the so-called Iron Curtain and the democratization of Central and Eastern Europe has been achieved. Could we have moved more quickly to help countries in transition push through reforms? And what kind of assistance could have been earmarked to do so? Could the early identification of, and reaction to, problems faced by countries in transition have a positive effect on their later development, and what would ignoring the signs mean in the long run?

In essence, when does a conflict end? Is it with the cessation of active hostilities, or with the resolution of its underlying causes? Croatia believes that identifying and addressing the root causes of a problem which can have regional or global repercussions is the most important factor in securing international peace and security. Just patching up a situation and not resolving fundamental antagonisms in a society can have the effect of leaving a wound to fester. This is equally important before, as it is after, a conflict or crisis has arisen: before, because it

can help avoid a conflict, and after, because it can help cure open wounds.

Let me remind the Council of a negative example. Seven years after the dissolution of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the aggression against Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, the succession issue of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is yet to be resolved and the new Federal Republic of Yugoslavia still refuses to accept existing borders and the equality of all successor States.

The next phase — post-conflict peace-building — is just as important as bringing a conflict or crisis to an end. A post-conflict society is usually weak. Its infrastructure is destroyed or damaged, its people are needy, resources are scarce, human rights are not efficiently protected and painful memories are still fresh. In addressing these issues, Croatia supports the views presented by Secretary-General in his report (A/51/950) entitled "Renewing the United Nations: a programme for reform". In that report the Secretary-General obliquely stated that successful peace-building requires a mutually reinforcing political strategy and assistance programme, incorporating human rights considerations and humanitarian and development programmes. The importance of mutual reaffirmation of these two approaches to peace-building cannot be overemphasized.

Building peace, as in the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina, has required not only the rebuilding and strengthening of civilian government and civil institutions and infrastructure, but also stimulating investment and restarting the economy through financial donors. The complete recovery and creation of a self-sustaining society, however, will occur only when root causes have been adequately addressed and resolved. Although it should be reiterated that the parties themselves must bear the primary responsibility in sustaining the achievements of the international community, continued support, especially from countries in the region concerned, will be an important element in assisting States such as Bosnia and Herzegovina to fulfil their obligations.

The post-war reconstruction and reconciliation processes which are taking place in Croatia are processes, or phenomena, that necessarily take time, but that can be accelerated through international support. Conditions for the return of displaced persons and refugees have been established, even though the economic and social situation in war-affected areas remains difficult. There is a significant shortage of capital for new investment, job creation and specific projects, such as demining. Therefore, the political, human and financial resources of the international community already invested in Croatia should be coupled with development assistance if the desired results are to be achieved. Investment in peace, followed by investment in development, is part of the same continuum. Accordingly, we hope that the conference on development held in Zagreb this month will have a successful follow-up.

The establishment of truth about a conflict and the punishment of perpetrators of grave conflict-related breaches of humanitarian law is another prerequisite for the re-establishment of peace and security. On the global level, the establishment of the International Criminal Court (ICC) should serve to aid and expedite the healing and reconciliation process. However, one must take heed of a serious warning: if we intend to develop the ICC into a credible institution, we must avoid the traps and shortfalls discovered in the practice of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. The Security Council cannot afford to allow the lack of cooperation of any State or entity — in this case the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Republika Srpska entity of Bosnia and Herzegovina — to distort the true picture of the conflict and thereby betray the fundamental objectives for which the Tribunal was founded. The process of reconciliation hinges upon bringing people like Sljivancanin, Mrksic, Radic, Martic, Karazdic and Mladic to justice.

**The President** (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Nigeria. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

**Mr. Akunwafor** (Nigeria): Please allow me at the outset to join those who have spoken before me in congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. Knowing your country's particular interest in and concrete contributions to the subject of today's debate, my delegation is confident that the deliberations of the Council will be conducted with skill and wisdom, and in a manner that will enhance the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter.

Maintaining and restoring international peace and security is a fundamental purpose of the United Nations. When, in October of this year, my delegation addressed the General Assembly on the report of the Security Council, we stressed the great importance which we attach to activities the Council undertakes in the discharge

of its primary responsibility on matters that directly affect our region. In the past year, the Council devoted about 60 per cent of its activities to conflicts in the continent of Africa.

Today the international community has to deal with an ever increasing number of new conflicts which must be promptly contained. True enough, there has been no large-scale regional conflict; yet many local wars have continued, and Africa has had more than its fair share. These conflicts have greatly impeded the socio-economic development of the continent, reduced the population to abject poverty and deprivation, created swarms of refugees and internally displaced persons, and generated serious apprehension on the part of the international community about the continent's future. My delegation too is disturbed by this trend of events. We are, however, pleased that the United Nations system is giving special consideration to the root causes of these conflicts, with a view to designing strategies for their resolution. The short-, medium- and long-term consequences of conflicts require a holistic approach that includes the full range of humanitarian and development assistance.

My delegation agrees with the Secretary-General that post-conflict peace-building must involve coordinated and integrated activities that address the root causes of violence, with a view to laying the foundations for a lasting peace. This comprehensive approach, which links peace, security, good governance, respect for human rights and sustainable development, represents a major paradigm shift in the activities of the United Nations. This innovation is quite unique. Nigeria firmly supports all United Nations efforts to strengthen its conflict-prevention and crisis-management capacity, and has always welcomed the initiatives of the Secretary-General in this field. My delegation believes that development is a prerequisite for creating a stable, secure and prosperous society.

As a long-term conflict-prevention strategy, post-conflict peace-building must be vigorously promoted, bearing in mind the specific circumstances of each case. Economic reconstruction, the rehabilitation of basic health and education facilities, and the safety of lives and property should help to ensure that the cessation of violence is real; these elements will contribute to the consolidation of peace, which is a prerequisite for sustainable growth and development.

Peace and prosperity are mutually reinforcing. The participation of donor Governments, non-governmental organizations and host Governments in this process has been critical to the successes witnessed in many regions, especially in the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) subregion.

In Sierra Leone and Liberia, the United Nations and the ECOWAS Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) are deeply involved in post-conflict peace-building activities. They monitor human rights violations and help the Governments to implement their disarmament and demobilization tasks. This kind of cooperation between the Security Council and a regional organization, already envisaged in the Charter, deserves recognition and support.

Finally, my delegation hereby requests the Security Council not to relent in its efforts to provide ECOMOG with the logistic, financial and technical assistance that it sorely requires to execute its mandate in our subregion. In this regard, I wish to draw the Council's attention to relevant presidential statements and to resolution 1216 (1998), adopted only two days ago, on the implementation of the Abuja Accord with regard to the crisis in Guinea-Bissau, signed by President Joao Bernardo Vieira and the Commander of the Self-Proclaimed Military Junta, General Ansumane Mane.

Although the ceasefire is holding, the situation is tense and could erupt at any time. Rapid deployment of ECOMOG interposition forces is critical to the restoration and consolidation of peace in that country. However, ECOWAS member States lack the means to do this. This explains the appeal to the international community to enable ECOMOG to undertake an operation of that magnitude. Although it is an internal crisis, it has the potential to threaten the peace and security of the ECOWAS subregion. Timely response to this request, therefore, will help nip this incipient crisis in the bud. We are more aware today of the risks associated with dispatching operations with inadequate resources. We have also learned that inaction in the face of a threat to international peace and security anywhere in the world is unacceptable.

**The President** (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Nigeria for the kind words he addressed to me. The next speaker is the representative of Slovakia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

**Mr. Varso** (Slovakia): Let me begin by congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the

presidency of the Security Council for this month. I would also like to thank your predecessor, the representative of the United States, for his effective leadership of the Security Council during the month of November.

Slovakia fully supports and has aligned itself with the statement of the European Union delivered earlier today by the representative of Austria. Allow me to make a few additional comments on behalf of my delegation.

The maintenance of international peace and security is, and will remain, one of the primary purposes of the United Nations. The experiences and achievements of the Organization in fulfilling this goal have shown that, although conflicts take a variety of forms, peacekeeping operations are one of the key instruments available to the United Nations to resolve those conflicts.

Slovakia shares the Secretary-General's view, expressed in his report on Africa, that peacekeeping operations in their various forms can be critical confidence-building measures. Judging from recent experience, it would seem that the multidimensional and interactive approach to peacekeeping as such is inevitable.

Slovakia has been participating in United Nations peacekeeping operations since its establishment as an independent State in January 1993. The active and successful participation of Slovak troops, serving under the United Nations flag in the United Nations Transitional Administration for Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and Western Sirmium (UNTAES), particularly in the area of engineering, has been recognized by the relevant authorities of the United Nations. Having obtained this practical experience in Eastern Slavonia, the Slovak Republic has offered its engineering units to support and strengthen the demining capability of the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara.

Moreover, Slovakia has also been involved in peacekeeping missions in Jerusalem, Angola and, recently, in the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) in the Golan Heights. In this regard, I would like to reiterate the intention and readiness of my country to increase, in close cooperation with Austria, its participation in UNDOF.

Regional arrangements have already become an integral part of the common effort of the international community to maintain peace and security in various parts of the world. Slovakia supports increasing cooperation between the United Nations and the regional organizations, especially in the area of early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and resolution, and post-conflict rehabilitation. As far as the European region is concerned, the Government of the Slovak Republic has recently approved the contribution of Slovakia, both financial and in personnel, to the Verification Mission in Kosovo and has also endorsed the participation of Slovak troops in the Stabilization Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

By the same token, the United Nations and the international community should provide assistance to those regional arrangements which, for various reasons, lack sufficient resources and expertise to face conflict situations in their regions. We welcome all efforts for improving peacekeeping training capacity aimed at enhancing the peacekeeping capacity of individual regions and their countries, in close cooperation with respective regional organizations. Slovakia is ready to contribute to these efforts through its Peacekeeping Training Centre, providing, in particular, training for combat engineers.

No doubt, the consolidation of peace in the post-conflict period is one of the most important steps in reducing the risk of the resumption of conflict. Peace-building efforts should address various factors of conflict and contribute to the creation of conditions for reconciliation, reconstruction and recovery. Post-conflict peace-building activities must be aimed at promoting a durable peace and sustainable development through, *inter alia*, humanitarian and development activities, confidence-building measures, the strengthening of democratic institutions and respect for human rights.

We have learned from many examples that humanitarian assistance plays a very important role at all stages of conflict and that it is an irreplaceable supplement to the comprehensive action of the international community in the peaceful settlement of disputes. In the prevention phase, it can significantly help to reduce the threat of conflict; during an ongoing conflict, it can prevent or reduce human suffering; and humanitarian assistance in the post-conflict stage helps to strengthen a durable peace. In most cases, the essential element of humanitarian assistance is a mine-action plan. Slovakia has done a lot, especially in mine clearance, during its participation in peacekeeping. We are developing our own mine-clearance programme and are ready to provide our skills, techniques and equipment and to participate in any activity of the international community in this regard.

However, we believe that an essential element of the settlement of conflicts is political will. The parties and countries concerned must show the will to rely upon political rather than military responses to problems and the will for good governance. On the other hand, the appropriate approach is also needed from the international community and Member States should show the willingness to act and to provide the United Nations with the necessary resources to handle conflicts.

**The President** (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Slovakia for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Bangladesh. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

**Mr. Chowdhury** (Bangladesh): It is a particular pleasure for Bangladesh to see you, Sir, a wise and capable diplomat, presiding over the Council's deliberations on this important subject.

Bangladesh commends the timely initiative of the Security Council in convening this meeting. This gives the States Members of the United Nations an opportunity to come up with ideas on how best the cause of international peace and security can be served and also how best the issue of post-conflict peace-building can be addressed. Our deliberations will help identify areas that are of interest to the United Nations and the international community.

The international situation today remains fluid. A climate of uncertainty persists. Commitments made in some major areas of international cooperation remain to be fulfilled. The interests of developing countries surely warrant high priority. The gap between the developed and developing countries, particularly the least developed countries, continues to widen. The problems that derive from poverty and social injustices are in many instances being compounded. Underdevelopment, poverty and social injustice constitute a source of frustration and even a possible cause of new conflicts. Stability, security, democracy and peace are far from being consolidated on a global scale. That will require a reversal of growing international inequalities. Disputes among nations and also within nations, violent conflicts, aggression, foreign occupation and interference in the internal affairs of States continue to frustrate the object of peaceful coexistence of States and peoples.

As we look at the nature of the conflicts and social strife that the world is experiencing today, we notice that inter-State wars and foreign occupation have been on the decline since the end of the cold war. This encouraging development is expected to contribute to the lessening of violence in the long run. However, intra-State conflicts, social strife, deprivation, abuses of human rights, ethnic aggrandizement and xenophobia continue to pose problems that result in violence and impinge on international peace and security.

International peace and security can best be strengthened by the actions not just of States but also of men and women, through the inculcation of a culture of peace and non-violence in every human being and in every sphere of activity. The elements of a culture of peace draw on age-old principles and values which are respected and held in high esteem by all peoples and societies. The objective of a culture of peace is the empowerment of people. It contributes effectively to the overcoming of authoritarian structures, and the accompanying exploitation, through democratic participation. It works against poverty and inequality and promotes development. It celebrates diversity, advances understanding and tolerance and reduces inequality between men and women. We regard the culture of peace as an effective expedient to minimize and prevent violence and conflict in the present-day world.

Over countless millenniums, humankind has failed to abolish or do away with war. Indeed, such eminent persons as Nobel Laureates Lester Pearson and Bertrand Russell have expressed the view that some people may even be thrilled at the prospect of war. What is clearly needed, therefore, as the eminent American philosopher William James said, decades before the United Nations came into existence, is something that is the moral equivalent of war — something that would be as heroic to people as war has often been depicted to be, but that is also compatible with the essential human spirit, which war emphatically is not. That is the need that the culture of peace strives to fulfil.

Conflicts in developing countries have their roots in poverty, hunger, ignorance, economic deprivation and lack of accountability in the use of political power. We need to address the root causes of conflict in a comprehensive and holistic manner.

The maintenance of international peace and security will depend in large measure on favourable conditions for durable peace after military conflict. The transition from

peacekeeping to peace-building obviously needs the close attention of the international community. Such a transition, if not properly managed, could seriously undermine peace and security. In fact, we have witnessed societies emerge from conflict situations only to indulge in fresh intra-State or intra-group conflicts. That is an aspect of peace and security and peace-building that cannot be overemphasized.

In the wars and conflicts of today the parties involved quite often resort to actions which constitute flagrant violations of human rights and international laws, particularly humanitarian laws. The weaker and vulnerable groups of society become easy and innocent victims of conflicts. Abuses of the rights of women and children are most common. In this regard, we welcome the role being played by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict. We also endorse the idea of treating children in conflict situations as zones of peace.

Bangladesh is committed to the cause of international peace and security. We have been a major contributor to the peacekeeping and peacemaking efforts of the United Nations and are prepared to work constructively with Member States in the promotion of the objectives of the United Nations Charter.

**The President** (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Bangladesh for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Indonesia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

**Mr. Wibisono** (Indonesia): I join previous speakers in congratulating you, Sir, the very able and skilful Ambassador of Bahrain, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. My congratulations are also addressed to the Ambassador of the United States on his excellent work as President of the Security Council for the month of November.

It was the expectation of the international community that the end of the cold war would lead to a lower level of regional conflict. Unfortunately, however, such conflicts, especially in the form of intra-State strife, have registered a substantial increase during the past few years. It is therefore of the utmost importance for the Organization to be able to prevent and contain the resurgence and escalation of conflicts, with their attendant consequences.

Hence, the issues of the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building continue to be the *raison d'être* of the United Nations, the reason for its very existence, especially in the changing context of the regional and international milieu. Beyond doubt, all Member States share the view that the pursuit of peace, security, development and prosperity is of paramount importance as we approach the new millennium. My delegation considers that discussion on these interlinked issues should be carried out within the framework of the Organization's agenda and under the respective competence of the various organs. Meanwhile, we need to devise a more viable system of collective security, as envisioned in the Charter, in which all Member States can participate in accordance with their respective capabilities. In that way, the burden of making the world safer for all would be equitably shared by all.

In this context, we have noted the recent proposal by the Secretary-General to broaden the role of the Security Council by invoking Article 65 of the Charter because of the increasing need for the Council to be provided with accurate and relevant information on economic, social and humanitarian crises that threaten international peace and security. We share his view that only efforts to resolve underlying socio-economic, cultural and humanitarian problems can place the achievement of peace on a durable foundation. However, Indonesia deems it proper and appropriate that any action by the Council in this sphere must be taken in conjunction with the Charter-mandated role and responsibilities of the wider membership, which is reflected in the General Assembly. This position is analogous to the one taken by the Non-Aligned Movement at its summit meeting held in Durban, South Africa, last September, which held that without prejudice to the competence of the other principal organs of the United Nations with regard to their respective roles in post-conflict peace-building, the Assembly must have the key role in decision-making.

Maintaining peace and security, whether in a conflict area or a potential conflict area, needs concerted and coordinated efforts by international and regional organizations and, more importantly, by the disputing parties. If these activities are conducted within the framework of Chapter VIII of the Charter, regional organizations can make a distinct contribution to the Security Council's efforts to seek peaceful solutions. It is also an undeniable truism that in efforts to resolve conflicts and to maintain peace and stability, regional organizations, for geographical, historical and other

reasons, are uniquely placed to propose viable solutions. Close cooperation and coordination between the regional organizations and the Security Council could substantially enhance the prospects for the political settlement of disputes without intervening in matters that are deemed to be the internal affairs of States.

Concurrently, we should also recognize that prolonging conflicts, especially those involving armaments, only brings increased hardship and suffering to the people. Of equal importance is that neither the United Nations nor regional organizations can impose preventive measures on conflicting States or parties without their consent. Such endeavours, if undertaken at the request of the parties or Governments concerned, have a greater chance of success. The request for, or at least acquiescence in, action by regional or international organizations is *conditio sine qua non* from the legal as well as the political perspective.

Indonesia is fully aware that the 16 United Nations peacekeeping missions dispatched during 1998, comprising 14,500 civilian and military personnel from 77 countries, including Indonesia, primarily deal with conflicts within States. These conflicts have resulted in half the world's war-related fatalities and have displaced millions of people. Nevertheless, it is of utmost importance that the traditional concept of peacekeeping operations be maintained. Such operations can be and still are useful if they are undertaken with the support of the overall membership of the Organization, are launched with the consent of all the parties involved and have a precise and realistic mandate within a specific time-frame setting out the main political objectives. It is equally essential that they be in full conformity with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, such as sovereignty and non-interference in internal affairs, as well as the recommendations and conclusions of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations.

The transition from peacekeeping to post-conflict peace- building is critical. It must be aimed at eliminating the factors that contributed to the strife and, more importantly, that contribute to the risk of a resumption of conflict, in order to create conditions more conducive to reconstruction and rehabilitation. It also calls for measures to ensure the security of civilians and an adequate infrastructure to more clearly define post-conflict peace-building needs and ways of meeting them.

In this regard, it is pertinent to note that the maintenance of peace calls for a well-structured programme, especially in the complex task of post-conflict peace-building, which requires a comprehensive and concerted approach encompassing, among other things, the transformation of armed movements into civilian mechanisms, the restructuring of the police and armed forces, strengthening the national judicial system, demining and, most important of all, national reconciliation through confidence- building measures, as well as international support for elections, the eradication of poverty and the promotion of democracy, sustainable development and respect for human rights. It is of crucial importance that, in the implementation of such steps by the international community, equal attention should be given to all post-conflict regions in providing aid and assistance, while the form of development chosen by the country should be respected.

In conclusion, the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building encompass many aspects, including economic development and social and humanitarian aspects, rather than solely military ones, and hence should not be the exclusive responsibility of the Security Council. They call for a multifaceted approach that requires the effective integration of the political, security, socio-economic and humanitarian dimensions. They should complement and be harmonious with each other. This calls for greater coordination and interaction between the General Assembly and the Security Council, which would serve greater unity of purpose and coherence of efforts.

**The President** (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Indonesia for the kinds words he addressed to me and to my predecessor.

The next speaker is the representative of Ukraine. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

**Mr. Yel'chenko** (Ukraine): First of all, let me congratulate you, Sir, on your effective presidency of the Security Council, and in particular on your timely initiative in convening this meeting. I would also like to pay tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Burleigh, for the excellent job he did last month.

Last Wednesday the open debate in the Security Council on the agenda item before it was suspended because of the situation in Iraq. The events of the past week, which are still awaiting the official reaction of the Council, made us all — let us be honest — take a new look at the role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security. In view of this, a

thematic, theoretical consideration of the agenda item before the Council today is indeed quite a difficult task.

Nevertheless, we believe that discussion of the various aspects of United Nations post-conflict peace-building activities in the context of the maintenance of international peace and security may provide a fresh assessment of those activities against the background of continuing changes in the international environment and the ongoing transformation of the United Nations itself.

The end of the cold war obliged the United Nations to enhance its role in global burden-sharing for peace by adapting its peacekeeping activities to emerging realities and new types of conflicts. As a result of this evolution, a second generation of United Nations peacekeeping operations — with multifunctional mandates, including assistance to war-torn societies in moving from violent conflict towards national reconciliation, economic reconstruction and democratic consolidation — came into being; this actually gave birth to post-conflict peace-building.

It is known that in the course of the last decade the United Nations accumulated valuable experience in this field. One may recall United Nations missions in Cambodia, Croatia, El Salvador, Mozambique and elsewhere. A United Nations post-conflict presence is at present maintained in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Haiti, Sierra Leone, Western Sahara and other countries or areas.

Ukraine has continuously contributed to such collective international efforts. As a matter of fact, representatives of our country have participated in a number of United Nations missions under post-conflict peace-building mandates, including those to Angola, Croatia, Guatemala, Mozambique and South Africa. Currently, representatives of Ukraine serve with United Nations missions in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in Angola. For the last few years, Ukrainian observers have been serving with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) mission in Georgia. Today, Ukraine is contributing its personnel to the OSCE Verification Mission in Kosovo. Ukraine also remains one of the guarantor States of the peaceful settlement of the Transdniestrian conflict, Republic of Moldova.

The evolution over the past decade of United Nations peacekeeping practice highlights the need for further development of its theory as well. In this regard, "An Agenda for Peace" (S/24111), submitted by the Secretary-General in 1992, and its Supplement of 1995 (S/1995/1) provided a solid theoretical foundation for the strengthening of United Nations capacities in maintaining international peace and security, including the concept of post-conflict peace-building.

Ukraine supported that process and took an active part in the deliberations of the four sub-groups of the General Assembly Working Group on An Agenda for Peace. Although the discussion in the sub-group on post-conflict peace-building demonstrated the existence of different views with regard to the problem of the competence and responsibilities of the principal bodies of the United Nations in this field, Ukraine believes that those differences are not insurmountable. Therefore, it would be a welcome development should this meeting of the Security Council contribute to the resumption of efforts aimed at the elaboration of a strategic framework for post-conflict peace-building activities.

This year we have already witnessed several encouraging steps undertaken within the United Nations in that direction. I refer, first of all, to the submission by the Secretary-General of a very important report, entitled "The causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa" (S/1998/318), which, *inter alia*, spotlighted the increasing significance of post-conflict peace-building and the need for its further consideration by both the Security Council and the General Assembly.

In our view, post-conflict peace-building activities have a special place among the tools for maintaining international peace and security, since they are designed to address comprehensively the political, economic, social and humanitarian problems of States in the wake of conflicts. Besides, such activities are undertaken, as a rule, only after other international peace support tools have been used in the areas of conflict. This makes the mandates of the post-conflict peace-building missions highly complicated, since they must either finalize the success, or compensate for the underachievements, of the previous missions. Therefore, we believe that in formulating the future mandates of post-conflict peace-building missions, more attention should be paid to the various preconditions of their deployment.

In the same vein, my delegation is of the view that parallel approaches should be pursued in launching post-conflict peace-building activities with a view to eliminating the different consequences of both intra- and inter-State conflicts.

We share the broadly held view that there is no standard post-conflict peace-building model. However, we strongly believe that any such activities should be carried out in full accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, at the request and on the basis of consent of the conflicting parties and with their full commitment to the cause of reconciliation, civilian reconstruction and durable peace.

My delegation remains convinced that the United Nations should continue to play a primary role as the coordinator and originator of guidelines for the post-conflict process, with the involvement of regional organizations.

The United Nations, which is like no other organization in existence, offers the best framework to this end. In this context, Ukraine maintains that constant political monitoring by the United Nations of the process of formation of the new states which, as a rule, emerge as a result of conflicts should be an integral part of the Organization's post-conflict peace-building strategies. We also deem necessary that such monitoring be performed by a specialized organ of the United Nations — for instance, the Trusteeship Council. In the light of the ongoing discussions about the further existence of this body, we may find that one way to revitalize its activities could be to assign to it a new mandate and to reconsider its title.

The wide range of United Nations activities in this area requires an integrated and coordinated approach in order to ensure the success of post-conflict peace-building. As we all are aware, the programme for reform initiated last year by the Secretary-General did not pass by United Nations post-conflict peace-building efforts. We are confident that thanks to the innovations introduced — primarily the designation of the Department of Political Affairs as the United Nations focal point for post-conflict peace-building — United Nations efforts in this area have become more coherent and comprehensive. The Security Council may wish to take this opportunity to request the Secretary-General to reflect on proposals for further improvements in this field.

I should like to conclude by expressing once again the hope that the outcome of our debate will contribute to the further development of the conceptual and operational framework of the United Nations post-conflict peace-building activities.

**The President** (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Ukraine for the kind words he addressed to me and to my predecessor, Ambassador Burleigh.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Australia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

**Mr. Crighton** (Australia): I am grateful, Mr. President, for the opportunity to contribute to the debate.

The maintenance of international peace and security is, of course, a core function of the United Nations. Primary responsibility for this function has been entrusted to the Security Council. It is a solemn responsibility, but it is not solely the responsibility of the Council. It is one shared by all Members of the United Nations.

It is in this light — and in view of our strong wish for greater openness and transparency in the working methods of the Council — that Australia particularly appreciates the initiative to convene this formal meeting to discuss an issue that is of direct concern to all of us.

The maintenance of international peace and security encompasses many things. Conventionally it is seen as the range of cooperative activities undertaken by the international community when a dispute is emerging or a conflict has erupted. These activities can range from preventive diplomacy to peacemaking, peacekeeping and post-conflict peace-building. It can also require peace enforcement.

We also know that other factors bear upon the maintenance of international peace and security. Poverty, ethnic differences, abuses of human rights, breakdowns in governance and access to fundamental freedoms, among others, are as much causes of dispute and conflict as more traditional ones such as territorial claims, ideology or access to natural resources. Maintaining peace and security requires that we address them, because failure to deal with the underlying causes of conflict will only ensure that peace will not be sustainable.

Social and economic development goals are, to state the obvious, an equally important and central part of United Nations activities. But all too often the tendency has been to see them as something different, activities apart — as, perhaps, a competing part of the United Nations agenda rather than as an integral part of its role in the maintenance of peace and security.

The experience of the United Nations over the last 50 years, particularly in intra-State conflicts, demonstrates that a more integrated, holistic approach is critical to our efforts to maintain international peace and security. A fragmented approach — dealing with peacemaking, peacekeeping, economic development, humanitarian assistance, refugees, institution-building and so on as though they were unconnected — will not work. The pieces need to be pulled together.

In practice, of course, this is no easy task. Creating the right political circumstances alone is demanding. It requires a high level of cooperation between the parties concerned. It requires a shared understanding about national goals and priorities. It requires a significant commitment of resources. It requires strong political and practical commitment from the full membership. And it requires a high level of cooperation and coordination between the various arms of the United Nations and other international agencies.

It is also true that the distinction between peacekeeping and peace-building is blurred, and the transition from one to the next is not simply like passing the baton in a relay. In practice there must be a substantial peace-building element to peacekeeping. Traditional peacekeepers can now be called on to perform a multifunctional role, for example assisting in the organization and conduct of elections or helping to meet urgent social, economic and institutional development needs.

In each case the needs will be different, and in each case the United Nations must be able to respond flexibly and realistically. We do not see this as redefining or reinterpreting the role of the Security Council, or giving it responsibilities that are rightly within the competence of other parts of the Organization. Rather, we see it as a challenge to the Organization as a whole and to the membership. The challenge is to develop what others have appropriately called a strategic framework, to give coherence to all the activities of the United Nations.

I stress, however, that the United Nations cannot do it alone. The United Nations contribution will be only as effective as the support it gets from the local parties and populations themselves. Without their full participation and cooperation, political and practical, the United Nations role and effectiveness will be heavily circumscribed. There is an important role here for regional organizations, which have the most direct interest in seeing tensions relieved, problems resolved and reconstruction begun. In Australia's own region, in the Asia-Pacific area, the United Nations Political Office in Bougainville is a very good current example of a small mission operating in support of a local and regional peace process.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate my Government's appreciation that this debate is taking place, and we thank you, Sir, for organizing it. It is a welcome response to the increasingly strong calls from the wider membership for greater openness and transparency in the way the Council works.

We understand and we accept that the Council cannot always debate issues in this way. We acknowledge that there are times when the need for speed, decisiveness and confidentiality are paramount. But it is equally true that there are many issues on which the Council can benefit from exposure to the views of the wider membership. We see more dialogue of this kind as a valuable and perhaps essential part of the process of modernization of the institutions of the United Nations, and as a vital aspect of maintaining the credibility and effectiveness of the United Nations as a whole.

**The President** (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Australia for the kind words he addressed to me.

The last speaker is the representative of India. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

**Mr. Sharma** (India): Post-conflict peace-building is a concept on which it appears that the only intergovernmental agreement is that we should speak on it for seven minutes. To respect this agreement I will cut my statement short, but I shall make available to delegations a fuller written version.

As the President of the General Assembly at its fifty-second session observed in his note of 7 August 1998, the main problem has been disagreement over assigning the key role for post-conflict peace-building to the General Assembly.

The Non-Aligned summit in Durban reiterated that the General Assembly must have the key role in the formulation of peace-building activities. In our view, the Security Council should not mandate peace-building activities until the General Assembly has laid down policy through universal intergovernmental deliberations.

India understands the argument that security has a broader context. But the Security Council is comparable to a Home Ministry in a national Government: it has an enlightened policing function. All Governments know that the tensions that sometimes explode in riots or civil unrest have social and economic roots; once order is restored, democratic Governments urgently address the causes of discontent. However, it is not the Home Ministry that authorizes the economic and social programmes needed for a long-term cure. There are, of course, exceptions where those in charge of security take decisions also on economic and social issues; these are called police States.

The Council is a purely political body. Its decisions reflect a balance of interests and power which is not constant. If the Council tries to build peace, its blueprint will either reflect the ideology of dominant members — in cases where others have no interest — or a hodgepodge, where conflicting views have to be reconciled. In neither case is this calculated to help the country concerned.

Perhaps the clearest analysis of peace-building so far was made last year by the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, which identified three core needs essential to peace-building, these being security, well-being and justice. Of these, the Security Council can legitimately address the first. The Commission's view was that there were three main sources of insecurity:

> "the threat posed by nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction; the possibility of conventional confrontation between militaries; and internal violence, such as terrorism, organized crime, insurgency and repressive regimes".

Of these, as the Commission also noted, the possibility of the use of nuclear weapons is the most destabilizing threat, both to international peace and security and to peace-building. Unfortunately, the permanent members of the Security Council are the ones that possess, and continue to refine, the largest nuclear arsenals. Unless they agree to dismantle those arsenals, there will be no true peace-building.

On violent conflicts fought with conventional weapons, the Commission noted,

> "The global arms trade in advanced weapons is dominated by the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council ...".

Again, the Security Council has much reason for introspection.

If the Council gets into the business of promoting well-being, and tries to guide post-conflict development activities, problems may be expected to follow. Among many other questions, the Council should consider the following.

What development paradigm will it follow? A choice among alternative strategies is a function of sovereignty. The imposition by the United Nations, on the instructions of the Council, of a particular paradigm may not only be resented; it could in fact exacerbate the economic and social tensions that created the political problems in the first place. Misguided peace-building could build frictions, leading to a fresh cycle of violence.

More than once, United Nations peacekeepers used to provide humanitarian assistance have been perceived as partisan, and their attempts to help have inflamed passions rather than dampening them. The same problems are inherent in peace-building. Once aid is perceived as biased, it becomes part of the problem; it fuels conflict; it does not build peace.

The distinction between the mandates of the United Nations funds, programmes and specialized agencies and those of the Security Council must not be blurred. They should execute only those activities authorized by their governing boards and stick to the expertise they have developed over the years.

When the Council began its discussions last week on the concept of post-conflict peace-building, we had prepared for a debate in general terms. However, the attack on Iraq over the last week has thrown up fundamental problems and questions which must be addressed. We are faced with a conflict resulting from unilateral action by some members of the Council. The international community might have its own views on how peace can be built in Iraq and its neighbourhood, and the Security Council as a whole may be sensitive to these views, but the views of the vast majority of countries do not find the receptivity they deserve among the members of the Council.

This in turn has two possible consequences. Either the Council will be unable to act, and will therefore lose its moral authority, or it will be propelled in a direction that does not conform either to the realities of the situation or to the wishes of the international community.

There is, of course, also the continuing danger that the Security Council will be bypassed on the grounds that its authorization is not needed. In none of these cases would the Council be discharging its obligations under Article 24 of the Charter. The creeping misuse of the Security Council for purposes not part of its mandate is certain to lower the Council's standing. We hope that all members of the Council will realize this.

The attack on Iraq also raises once again the question of the validity or the usefulness of sanctions. In Iraq, sanctions were used as a tool for peace-building, to ensure that Iraq did not have either stockpiles of, or the means to produce, weapons of mass destruction. However, if peace-building also means, as it must, addressing the needs of the populations affected by conflict, sanctions, as in the case of Iraq, clearly thwart this objective. The international community's goal is to ensure that Iraq and its neighbours live in peace with each other, that the events of the 1980s and 1990s are not repeated and that Iraq is enabled to join the comity of nations. Only this would truly build peace.

Again, the Council is faced with a choice: either it asserts its authority and takes such practical decisions on sanctions as would truly build peace, or it might find that its ability to lead the international community is impaired. After all, agencies and programmes of the United Nations system have detailed the horror of what sanctions have wrought in Iraq.

According to the United Nations Children's Fund, 90,000 deaths each year are directly attributable to the effects of sanctions, which means three quarters of a million killed so far; 1 million children under the age of five are chronically malnourished; and education has been shattered, with 84 per cent of schools needing rehabilitation and enrolment down sharply.

According to the World Health Organization, the health system is close to collapse. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations/World Food Programme, there has been a significant deterioration in agriculture, which needs attention and investments that cannot be given to it under the oil-for-food programme.

In the interests of peace, if not in the name of humanity, the Security Council has to realize that this is not a crisis that can be allowed to drag on indefinitely or to deepen. There has to be a policy towards closure which respects both Security Council resolutions and the human dignity of the people of Iraq.

The events which led to the attack on Iraq also make it clear that the personalities and actions of those most closely involved in post-conflict peace building are crucial to success. By and large, the Secretary-General and the international community have been very well served by those international civil servants who have been made primarily responsible for post-conflict peace-building. Exceptions make it clear how crucial their role is and how sensitive and delicate a charge it is to carry out responsibilities which have a critical bearing on building peace in regions of conflict, and to avoid coming under suspicion of serving agendas other than international peace and security.

We thank you, Mr. President, for your initiative in enabling us to consider this important item.

**The President** *(interpretation from Arabic)*: I thank the representative of India for his kind words addressed to me.

I thank the representatives of States who have made statements. I believe that the number of speakers, both in the formal meeting held on Wednesday, 16 December, and today, reflects the great attention that is given to the subject of the close and logical links between peacekeeping and post-conflict peace-building.

Many good ideas have been put forward. I hope that the Security Council will benefit from such views when taking its decisions relating to international peace and security.

The Security Council will take whatever action it deems necessary in its decision-making to translate such ideas into concrete actions.

There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

*The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.*